

### REMARKS

In response to the Office Action dated April 10, 2006, reconsideration and allowance of the present application are respectfully requested. Claims 1-36 remain pending in the application. By this Amendment, claims 1-3, 5, 6, 9, 10, 13-23, 25 and 27-33 are amended; and dependent claims 34-36 are new. No new matter is added.

Dependent claims 34-36 are new. Support for the new claimed features can be found in the specification at least at page 9, line 26 through page 10, line 7; and Page 28, lines 1-8.

A personal interview was held on June 15, 2006 with Examiners Pyzocha and Moise. A summary of the interview is provided below.

During the interview, Examiner Pyzocha noted that the March 6, 2006 Amendment did not appear to incorporate the claims amendment as previously presented in the June 9, 2005 Amendment, and requested incorporation of all previously presented amendments. To address the Examiner's concerns, the claims are amended to incorporate the previous amendments of June 9, 2005. Applicants respectfully submit that the claims as amended are now compliant.

Paragraph 4 of the Office Action rejects claims 30 and 31 under 35 USC 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

During the interview, Applicants reviewed the features recited in claims 30 and 31. Examiner Pyzocha indicated during the interview that the written arguments presented in advance for the interview sufficed to overcome the rejection. For example, the specification recites: "For example, governmental entities might use a

chain of custody to help compute and collect taxes or other levies. The TCU provides such an evidence chain by receiving an original executed or signed document and verifying the identity of the signer and the authenticity of documents received. The TCU retrieves CRLs from a directory, checks the CRLs for Certificate validity, and checks the expiration date of the Certificate" (specification at page 20, lines 3-6). See, also, specification at page 32, lines 25-34. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Paragraph 6 of the Office Action rejects claims 1, 2, 5-10, 13-15, 17-27 and 32-33 under 35 USC 103 (a) as being unpatentable over US Patent 5,191,613 (Graziano et al.) in view of U.S. Patent 4,885,777 (Takaragi et al.), US Patent 4,988,209 (Davidson et al.), and further in view of US Patent 5,422,953 ('953 Fischer). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Applicants have disclosed a method of handling stored electronic original objects to create a single electronic authoritative copy that is the equivalent of a paper original. Applicants' disclosure makes possible electronic promissory notes, electronic bills of lading and other financial instruments based on an electronic authoritative object. None of the applied references relate to an electronic authoritative object serving as a Transferable Record. They do not suggest transferable records involving electronic original objects. Applicants have realized that there were tremendous economies to be had by replacing paper with equivalent tightly controlled electronic documents. At the time, those in the industry were focused on taking small steps to minimize risk and gain user acceptance. Applicants' understanding of the problems uniquely enabled Applicants to achieve innovative solutions as claimed. No one at the time of the invention went beyond

simple electronic signatures, and no other at the time of Applicants' invention, understood that the answer required a trusted repository capable of maintaining the authoritative copy. Rather, most experts in the industries preferred to rely on the paper authoritative copy in reserve.

During the interview, Applicants have pointed out that the applied references do not relate to the claimed method of handling stored electronic original objects. In response, the Examiner suggested certain clarifying claims language for further consideration. As currently amended, Applicants' claim 1 is amended to recite, among other features, "establishing at least one type of information object as an authoritative copy object that is not to be released by a trusted third-party repository of information objects;...and identifying and controlling at least one selected authoritative copy object as a transferable record"; Applicants' claim 22 is amended to recite, among other features and amendments, "communicating the data structure to the user, the data structure communicated to the user representing an impaired version distinct from the unique authoritative storage copy that is not to be released by the trusted third-party repository of information objects"; and Applicants' claim 25 is amended to recite, among other features and amendments, "establishing at least one type of information object as an authoritative copy object that is not to be released by a trusted third-party repository of information objects;... identifying and controlling at least one selected authoritative copy object as a transferable record." The applied references do not teach or suggest at least these claimed features.

Further, Applicants' disclosed trusted repository verifies the authenticity of the submissions it receives, noting the date-time of acceptance and including this date-time and the electronic record received in a wrapper that prevents any future

unauthorized alteration. The trusted repository versions, stores and controls revisions to the authoritative copy, but assures that only one stored electronic original object is designated as the authoritative object. Actions relating to the electronic original object are implemented for control by the trusted repository based on the owner instructions.

Even if combined, the Graziano et al. patent, the Takaragi et al. patent, the Davidson et al. patent, the '953 Fischer patent; and/or with the '877 Fischer patent and the Leonhardt et al. patent, individually or in combinations as suggested by the Examiner, do not teach or suggest "establishing at least one type of information object as an authoritative copy object that is not to be released by a trusted third-party repository of information objects;...and identifying and controlling at least one selected authoritative copy object as a transferable record," as recited in claim 1; "communicating the data structure to the user, the data structure communicated to the user representing an impaired version distinct from the unique authoritative storage copy that is not to be released by the trusted third-party repository of information objects," as recited in claim 22; and "establishing at least one type of information object as an authoritative copy object that is not to be released by a trusted third-party repository of information objects;... identifying and controlling at least one selected authoritative copy object as a transferable record," as recited in claim 25.

Paragraph 7 of the Office Action rejects claims 3, 11, 12, 16, 28 and 29 under 35 USC 103 as being unpatentable over the Graziano et al. patent, the Takaragi et al. patent, the Davidson et al. patent, the Fischer patent, and further in view of US Patent 4,868,877 ('877 Fischer). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claims 3, 28, 29 create an object inventory or manifest that identifies other electronic records that are associated with the authoritative copy. It is also used bundle a set of authoritative copies that are grouped for transactions such as securitization. The binding provided by the object inventory is/may be used by the trusted repository to manage and check completion of owner authorized actions such as transfer of ownership or custody (i.e., that transfer of all identified records has in fact occurred). It may also be used to bind electronic counterpart signature pages to the authoritative copy that the signers indicated they intended to sign. The applied references do not teach or suggest these features.

Claims 11, 12, and 16 are dependent claims. The claimed features provide additional layers of assurance that enhance the trusted repositories ability to identify, protect, manage and store authoritative copies. The applied references do not teach or suggest these features.

Paragraph 8 of the Office Action rejects claim 4 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over the Graziano et al. patent, the Takaragi et al. patent, the Davidson et al. patent, the '953 Fischer patent, the '877 Fischer patent, and further in view of US Patent 5,424,526 (Leonhardt et al.). This rejection is respectfully traversed

Claim 4 is a dependent claim that recites a metadata summarizing a deal. The claim encompassing the meta data being inserted by a trusted repository into an object inventory allowing it to later identify the reason for the creation of the object inventory and for governing how the object inventory may be used. The applied references do not teach or suggest these features.

Applicants respectfully submit that these obviousness rejections are based on an improper hindsight reconstruction of the presently claimed invention from isolated disclosures in unrelated references. The Graziano et al. patent, the Takaragi et al. patent, the Davidson et al. patent, the '953 and '877 Fischer patents and the Leonhardt et al. patent are not in any way concerned with transferable records or authoritative copies. Without Applicants' disclosure, one of ordinary skill would not be motivated to combine those isolated disclosures. Withdrawal of the rejections is earnestly solicited.

Thus, independent claims 1, 22 and 25 are allowable over the applied references. The remaining claims depend from the aforementioned independent claims and recite additional advantageous features which further distinguish over the documents relied upon by the Examiner. As such, these claims are also considered allowable.

All objections and rejections raised in the Office Action having been addressed, it is respectfully submitted that the application is in condition for allowance and a Notice of Allowance is respectfully solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

BUCHANAN INGERSOLL PC

Date: June 30, 2006

By: 

Richard J. Kim  
Registration No. 48,360

P.O. Box 1404  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1404  
(703) 836-6620